



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,091	08/27/2003	Anthony J. Bacrocher	0112300-1411	4932

7590 05/09/2007  
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC  
P.O Box 1135  
Chicago, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER
----------

HOEL, MATTHEW D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/09/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

H

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,091	BAERLOCHER, ANTHONY J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew D. Hoel	3714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.

(3) Adam Masia, attorney.

(2) Scott Jones, primary examiner.

(4) Patricia Chidiac, attorney.

Date of Interview: 04 May 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 28, 29, 34-41, 43-46, 72-76, 78-81 and 94-124.

Identification of prior art discussed: Frohm, Bennett.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**SCOTT JONES**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiners and the applicant's representatives agreed that the proposed amendments to Claims 28 and 72 distinguish above Bennett and Frohm. No agreement was reached on the proposed amendments to 94 to 96, as the examiner believed they read on a minimum average payout required by gaming regulations. The applicants pointed to Fig. 13 of their spec. to more precisely point out their invention. 50 in the top row of Fig. 13 only corresponds to 10, 20, and 30 in the bottom row and 40 in the top row of Fig. 13 only corresponds to 10, 20, and 30 in the bottom row, so the total expected award when 50 or 40 appear in the top row will be an average expected value. This is enabled by pages 39 and 40 in the spec. Mr. Masia indicated the claims would be more precisely drafted to reflect the invention of Fig. 13 (pp. 39, 40, spec.). The upper and lower rows of Fig. 13 in the spec. do not move completely independently of each other, thus the average expected award.